UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson | Louis L. Mann | Curtis W. Reese

Secretary Kellogg's Proposed Treaty for the Outlawry of War

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The Kellogg Proposal to Outlaw War

(Chicago Tribune Radio Service)

By SALMON O. LEVINSON

Science and Standardized Education

By CLARENCE R. SKINNER

We Hail You, Mother India!

By EUGENE MILNE COSGROVE

Christian Agnosticism

By MILDRED W. STILLMAN

VOLUME CI | NUMBER 9

Chicago, April 30, 1928

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROUSES, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUTHERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Norman T. Dowd
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lusidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

Editors:

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**
Curtis W. Reese **Louis L. Mann**

UNITY is a weekly paper, sixteen pages, containing timely editorial comment, special articles, foreign correspondence by its own representatives in Europe and Asia, book reviews, and regular reports of news from the field of liberal thought and action.

UNITY was the first American paper to discover Gandhi, of India. When the great Mahatma was unknown even to newspapers, UNITY hailed him as "the greatest man in the world." Its files contain the most complete record of Gandhi and his work that exists in this country. His autobiography, "The Story of My Experiments with Truth" is now appearing in weekly installments.

UNITY was the first American paper to espouse and advocate the Outlawry of War, that remarkable peace program that is challenging the attention of the world.

UNITY has for more than forty years championed the idea of universal religion which finds in freedom the secret of unity and brotherhood, and it is today the outstanding organ of world religion.

Sample copies on request.

$3.00 per year.

700 Oakwood Boulevard **CHICAGO**

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Secretary Kellogg's Proposed Treaty for the Outlawry of War—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES..167
Notes 168
Science and Standardized Education—CLARENCE R. SKINNER 169
Jottings—J. H. H....171
Editorial Correspondence: American Notes—The Connecticut Valley—SYDNEY STRONG...171

ARTICLES—
The Kellogg Proposal to Outlaw War—(Chicago *Tribune* Radio Service) S. O. LEVINSON 173
We Hail You, Mother India!—EUGENE MILNE COSGROVE 174
Christian Agnosticism—MILDRED W. STILLMAN.176

POETRY—
The Carpenter of Heaven — KENNETH W. PORTER 180

THE STUDY TABLE—
A Plea for Outlawry—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.177
Short Stories by Zona Gale—MARGERY LATIMER.177

CORRESPONDENCE—
Women in the Campaign—LUCIA AMES MEAD..178
A Monument to John Brown—John Brown Memorial Association 179

THE FIELD—
Ella Boynton—E. LL. J....179
American Writers Felicitate Maxim Gorky....179
Program—National Child Labor Committee...179
Social Reform in India....180

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CI | MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1928 | NUMBER 9

Secretary Kellogg's Proposed Treaty for the Outlawry of War

"The President of the United States, the President of the French Republic, His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, the President of the German Republic, His Majesty the King of Italy, His Majesty the Emperor of Japan,

"Deeply sensible that their high office imposes upon them a solemn duty to promote the welfare of mankind;

"Inspired by a common desire not only to perpetuate the peaceful and friendly relations now happily subsisting between their peoples, but also to prevent war among any of the nations of the world;

"Desirous by formal act to bear unmistakable witness that they condemn war as an instrument of national policy and renounce it in favor of the pacific settlement of international disputes;

"Hopeful that, encouraged by their example, all the other nations of the world will join in this humane endeavor and by adhering to the present treaty as soon as it comes into force bring their peoples within the scope of its beneficent provisions, thus uniting the civilized nations of the world in a common renunciation of war as an instrument of their national policy;

"Have decided to conclude a treaty and for that purpose have appointed as their respective plenipotentiaries; .....

.....

"Who having communicated to one another their full powers found in good and due form have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I

"The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

ARTICLE II

"The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

On Sunday, April 14th, Secretary of State Kellogg presented to the five great powers of the world a specimen treaty for the Outlawry of War, of which the above paragraphs constitute the essential features. This is "the biggest piece of news," said the Rev. Charles Francis Potter, in his New York pulpit the next day, "that has been printed in the lifetime of any one in this congregation." We agree with this judgment, and with Dr. Potter's further statement, "We are witnessing the dawning of a new day. The hope of world peace is nearer than at any time before in the history of our race."

Mr. Kellogg's action is notable from at least two points of view. First, and more specifically, the Secretary of State is keeping rigorously to the business of *outlawing war* without conditions, compromises or reservations. It will be remembered that Secretary Briand began negotiations by trying to confine the outlawry proposal to France and the United States. Mr. Kellogg replied, in effect, that war has a universal status, and that therefore the business of getting rid of it concerned everybody. Then M. Briand attempted to make distinction between aggressive and defensive wars. To which the American Secretary answered, in effect, that he was concerned with *war,* and was not interested in qualifying adjectives! Finally, in his latest letter, the Foreign Secretary of France laid down three conditions under which he was alone willing to proceed. In our issue of April 16th last, commenting on these conditions, we said that "none of them seem to us to be obstacles to . . . agreement." Mr. Kellogg justifies this viewpoint by now taking the last decisive step without making any reference to these conditions whatsoever. He keeps to his objective, which is *war,* and its complete renunciation by the nations "as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another."

This brings us to the second notable aspect of Secretary Kellogg's action. "He has the opportunity," we said, in our editorial of April 16th last, "to submit an Outlawry formula to the world which will, at the least, test the sincerity of the European nations on the question of war, and which may, at the most, lay the ground for the long-sought establishment of durable peace." This opportunity the American Secretary has now utilized in a way to mark a new epoch in human history. Without reservation or restriction of any kind, as we have said, he has formally laid before the five great powers of the world a formal draft treaty for the outlawry of war as a method of settling international disputes. "The settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin . . . shall never be sought except by pacific means." These are not the words of a fanatic or a dreamer—a wild, irresponsible private citizen indulging the luxury of personal whimsy. On the contrary, they are the official words of a responsible cabinet-minister, suggesting to the dominant governments of the world a program for getting rid of war. Nothing like this has ever been done before. This is something new—and decisive. What wonder that a thrill is passing 'round the world, and that men are taking hope again! What was not done in 1918-1919 may now be done in 1928-1929. How great the challenge, and how bright the prospect!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Turkey fills much less space in the newspapers than Russia and Italy, but is a center of astounding changes all the same. Indeed, we doubt if there is any man in the world today who is doing so much in the way of progress as Kemal, who may yet be rated as one of the greatest men of this age. His feat in saving Turkey from the debacle of the Great War is second only to that of Lenin's feat in saving Russia. In the ten years which have succeeded upon this event, Kemal has taken Turkey out of feudalism and placed her in the front rank of modern nations. What western Europe took five hundred years to accomplish, in other words, Kemal has accomplished for his people in a decade. The modernization of government, the development of education, the emancipation of women, all these are milestones of amazing progress. Now comes another and still more amazing step—namely, the separation of church and state—a fact not yet achieved even in England. Turkey seems to have gone farther in this matter than the United States, or any other nation which has undertaken to end connection between religion and government. Thus, the withdrawal of recognition of Islam as the state religion has gone so far that deputies swearing allegiance to the state are relieved from the obligation of taking the divine name. They now swear upon their own honor, instead of, as formerly, "in the name of Allah." This does not signify, as it would in Soviet Russia, that the state is hostile to the church. On the contrary, it simply means that Turkey has carried through to the very end political severance from Islam as the national religion. What this means we may realize if we look back a few years and see the Sultan sitting in his palace as the head of the Moslem faith throughout the world. These are astonishing times—and not the least of what is being done is the handiwork of Kemal.

We prophesy: There will be a thoroughgoing overhauling of and by the Daughters of the American Revolution and other patriotic organizations, certain persons in which have brought their affairs to a state of popular contempt by their outrageous abuse of the true sentiment of hundreds and even thousands of their own members, and by their "crusade" against the very kind of people who were the forebears of this strangely unpatriotic breed. The most hated word to their ears is "revolution," and the most despised "democracy." For that matter, there is little that the founders of the Nation or of the societies believed that is not anathema. What the country needs is not chiefly an end of this blacklisting asininity (that takes care of itself), but a complete purging of all organizations of foolish and mischievous people who do not know the first principles and do not illustrate the chief attributes of Americans.

Thus speaks our contemporary, the *Christian Register,* of Boston. Before these words were published, the good work had begun with the Ku Klux Klan of Pennsylvania, which it is never to be forgotten is one of these patrioteer, anti-"red," 100 per cent American organizations. Once it had gotten into court, thanks to its own insane folly in starting a suit in equity, the Klan's deviltries were promptly revealed and denounced. Said Federal Judge W. H. S. Thompson, dismissing the suit:

This unlawful organization, so destructive of the rights and liberties of the people, have come in vain asking this Court of Equity for injunctive or other relief. They come with filthy hands and can get no assistance here.

Plaintiffs' prayer for relief is denied and the bill is dismissed at the cost of the plaintiffs.

Next in line, as the *Christian Register* prophesies, is the Daughters of the American Revolution. In saying this, we do not intimate that the D. A. R. are guilty of mobbing unhappy victims of their displeasure, or of burning them alive, or of any other of the abominations proved against the Klan. Nice ladies do not do horrid things of this kind! But the psychology of the Daughters is identical with that of the Klu Kluxers though their manners are different. They seek the same purposes of repression and persecution, if not by the same methods. The D. A. R., precisely like the K. K. K., is an organization "destructive of the rights and liberties of the people," to quote Judge Thompson's words, and a cleaning-up is not only due but overdue. Then, next in line, is the American Legion, not so vulgar, obstreperous, and downright indecent as it used to be, but a nefarious organization all the same. Only last year the American Civil Liberties Union reported that, in many parts of the country, the Legion was taking the place of the Klan as the chief agent of social debauchery and oppression. American life will never be sound until it has been cleansed of these sources of infection.

We have long been interested in noting the calamities that Prohibition is responsible for in the eyes of its enemies. The crime-wave in America since the War is of course the result of Prohibition. The fact that all other countries the world around have similarly suffered from crime-waves has not been allowed to embarrass this argument. Some time ago it was declared that Prohibition was to blame for the sinking of the submarine S-4. Other nations knowing nothing of Prohibition have lost submarines—but this doesn't seem to count. The New York *World* correspondent reported some weeks ago that Prohibition was one of the causes of the dreadful conditions prevailing in Chicago. Of course we have had such conditions in our American municipalities for decades—it was before the opening of this century that James Bryce discovered our city administrations to be the one most conspicuous failure in American government. But the *World* reporter, presumably a young man, knows nothing of all this. Now comes something like a climax in the statement of Dr. Frederick J. Melville, Lutheran pastor in White Plains, New York, that Prohibition is responsible for empty churches.

Why are the church pews empty? (He asks.) The radio is not the reason; the automobile is not to blame, the theatre has kept no one from church. If the church wants to make an honest confession it will have to admit that among various

causes for decreased church attendance the preaching of Prohibition takes the lead.

This pronouncement, following hard upon these others, makes us feel that the enemies of the Eighteenth Amendment are getting desperate for arguments. We shall soon expect to hear that it is Prohibition which was responsible for the Mississippi floods, the breaking of the St. Francis Dam in California, and the fogs that prevail along the New England coast in the summer vacation days. Why not? These claims are not less sensible than the others which we have named. Blame everything on what you hate. That's the rule!

Do you keep your eye on the news of mergers, and then more mergers? Banks are at it. All kinds of industrial concerns are at it. In the field of railroad equipment and accessories, a six hundred million dollar merger is in process. The Radio Corporation and the Victor Talking Machine Company are soon to be together. Not a week passes but one or more major combinations are reported. To what end? To effect economies; to do with fewer men; to increase the output and reduce the cost; to command the market and eliminate the wastes of competition. In short, the competitive system is killing itself. Strength to its arm, and freedom to its aims, so far as it will use its strength to that end, and so far as it will hold true to that aim! It may not be clear where we, the public, are coming out, but it is certain that our vaunted competitive program is facing its nemesis. The period through which our economic system is passing is fraught with woe to multitudes. With all of our prosperity, unemployment is rife and is spreading. These mergers mean more of it. The aim is to dispense with unnecessary workers. The inhumanity of our industrial organization, and ultimately its rank inefficiency, are revealed in the unconcern of industry over workers who are dispensed with and not caught up again in new enterprises where their released energies may be utilized. Industry is not consuming its own smoke. It is so proud of its economies through machine processes and consolidations that it overlooks the colossal waste of leaving human energy unemployed. Only a false pride will glory in any program which leaves human beings idle and starving, or distraught over the means of livelihood. No system can be efficient, in any sense worthy the term, which wastes human energy. Efficiency inspires the machine, which reduces the strain on human energy and makes a given amount go the farthest possible. But efficiency is not efficiency when it defaults on the demand to keep all employed in fruitful enterprise all the time. Our social system is challenged. Machines and mergers must learn the aims and methods of humanity.

There is revolt against denominational disrepute in the stampede to form community churches. It must be hoped that there is also a more positive and constructive trend. The movement involves perils. Calling a cabbage a rose does not make it smell like one. It is to be feared that the growing popularity of the community church movement is enticing into the group religious organizations which are still enamored of all that is distinctive and objectionable in the sectarian church, but which are desirous of reviving their failing fortunes by assuming the name and cloak of a community institution. The community church is more than a form. Indeed, the form is inconsequential, and often hampers if it does not stifle the spirit which the community church essentially is. Every community church must soft-pedal its designation as a church, for a repudiation of all which makes ecclesiasticism itself is essential to the community spirit. It is a question whether the name will not need to be dropped from organizations which sincerely desire to express the spontaneous religious impulses of a given population. Only usage and the preservation of the sanctities of religion can justify existing community churches in retaining the name. Nearly everything that the popular mind associates with the church is so alien to the spirit and purpose which inform the real community church, that the name is latterly a handicap to be overcome rather than an asset to be capitalized. Nobody can say how many organizations there are now in the country which have assumed the name. The list lengthens every day. Or it would if there were one! Happily nobody is authorized to make even a list. Much less will the effort ever be successful to bring the scattered organizations into a "national" body. Those who, in this day of disillusionment, flee the evils of denominationalism in the ambition to form another denomination will gain cool comfort from the enlightened community churchman. Whatever other follies may be indulged, the movement will not fall into that pit.

Science and Standardized Education

Critics of certain phases of society should not lose sight of the fact that institutions spring from life processes and reflect the direction of social evolution. They are not single and isolated entities, but are rather organic growths with deep and widespread roots. True and searching criticism does not content itself with playing over the surface of forms and products, but probes into the nature of fundamental forces. Frequently the institution, or some phase of it, is not primarily at fault so much as our whole social trend which the institution expresses.

This is especially true in regard to education, for

scholastic methods are not products of a fiat of the will, but are rather the result of powerful and sometimes irresistible forces and tendencies in social evolution. Let us take as a concrete illustration of this the question of our standardized education against which we hear so universal an outcry.

Those who oversimplify the case say that standardization is undesirable and that the culture of the uniqueness of each personality is desirable. They would therefore shift the emphasis from standardization to individualization. While this criticism has its valid elements and is both allowable and desirable within certain limits, it is more important to move the previous question and to ask whether standardization is not inevitable in the very nature of our modern world, and more particularly inevitable in the nature of our modern science.

The most generally accepted definition of science is "organized knowledge." Looked at objectively, we have a vast array of facts about every phase of the universe from spectrum analysis of star-rays, to the measured electron. The insatiable mind of man sends tentacles out over every visible and imaginary particle of matter and form of behavior, rakes them in, stands them in rows on the laboratory table, labels them, and makes them march into categories like an army of modern soldiers. They click into place as all well trained facts should, a formula is clamped down upon them, and henceforth they become rigid prisoners of science. Standardized!

The question is whether education can escape inevitable mechanizing and useful process of reducing the universe to facts? Who is to prevent the chemist or physicist from discovering the formulae by which we can see into the nature of organic and inorganic phenomena? And when he has discovered them, who will allow any young mind to insist that H_3O makes water. Why should any education allow or encourage young Arthur F. Searchwell in insisting upon the uniqueness of his personal view when we know that it is wrong.

Similarly with mathematics. $X^2 \times Y^2 = X^2 + 2 \times Y + Y^2$, and that is that. The whole value of mathematics to science is due to the fact that mathematics can provide some hard and fast, dependable, thoroughly standardized formulae which have no uniqueness, no personality, no exceptions. Physics builds upon its rigidity; astronomy builds upon it; engineering builds upon it. Here is a world of science which is reduced to exactitude calculable in terms of 1/10000 of an inch or to an infinitesimal fraction of a second.

And because this is so, we have predictability and progress. When bridges are built, they are standardized so as not to fall down; when physicians operate they are standardized so that their patients have a chance of recovery; when Fords are built, they are standardized so as to get there and back.

And this is exactly what the world wants, and what the world will have in increasing measure. Industrial products, chemical products, agricultural products are going to be "bigger and better" because applied science will standardize them and the men who make them.

Shall young Arthur F. Searchwell not also become standardized in his education by this vast amount of organized knowledge which is daily growing vaster and more accurate and more exacting? He may say that $2 \times 2 = 5$ in Prof. James' class in philosophy, but if he says it anywhere else he won't become a bank president; he will have to be a mere professor of philosophy or a newspaper editor, or somebody who doesn't *know*, and consequently someone who is not in demand.

Looking into the future, what is the prospect? More organized knowledge, more science, therefore more standardization.

We can express our uniqueness when there are no formulae. But psychology, ethics, religion, business threaten to become sciences. If we continue for the next seventy-five years as we have been doing in the past seventy-five years, there will be hardly a dark spot in the universe where we can take our pet ignorance and indulge our uniqueness. When we know our emotions as we now know our mathematics, the surprise and naiveté will largely pass from life. When we know ourselves from our epidermis to our inmost hopes; when we become reduced to tables and logarithms; when we know just how much adrenelin will make just seven pounds of hate and anger; what chance will there be for the uniqueness and spontaneity of Arthur F. Searchwell?

As man's indomitable will conquers more territory for truth, as his passion for order reduces more mysterious phenomena to law, what reason is there to suppose that he will not become increasingly standardized? And who can blame the educational process for this? Is it not in the inescapable nature and tendency of modern life as produced by modern science? And can we be anything but loyal to the ever-increasing trend which brings truth and law out of the chaos of the temperamental as opposed to the exact?

When young Lawrence T. Searchwell, Harvard '59, receives his diploma, will he be more standardized than his father, who is now in high school? He will! And will his alma mater be criticised for it? It will! And what will be the real cause of the difficulty? The restless, relentless mind of man who is ever restless until he has reduced mystery to a formula, even if in the process he makes the mystery of himself a standardized, museum specimen.

CLARENCE R. SKINNER.

Jottings

The revolt now in full swing against the Daughters of the American Revolution and other patriotic societies, is a healthy thing. It will accomplish little with the Daughters, for one might as well tickle the shell of a turtle and expect to see him squirm as to speak in terms of truth and reason to these hate-hardened heresy-hunters and have them understand. But the campaign will reach and change much public sentiment, after all.

There are 23,127,315 automobiles in the United States, or one to every 5.13 persons. Is that all? Judging by traffic conditions as we find them in various places, we had supposed that there must be not less than one machine to every .10 persons.

Just as everything is going so beautifully with Mr. Hoover's boom for the presidency, Secretary Wilbur had to come out and endorse it. This was hard luck—the hardest blow that Mr. Hoover has encountered since he started his campaign. His managers should lose no time in disavowing Secretary Wilbur's fatal word.

In the recent primary elections in Chicago Mayor Thompson promised to resign if District Attorney Crowe were defeated. Mr. Crowe was defeated by nearly 200,000 votes. But Mr. Thompson did not resign. "Resign?" he cried, on the morning after. "Why should I?" Why, indeed? Why should any man like Thompson keep his plighted word?

It is difficult to believe that the bomb recently exploded in Italy was intended for the King. Why should anybody want to kill this little man? Of all the ciphers in public life today, is there any cipher quite so empty as the Italian monarch under Mussolini?

The more we see of other trans-Atlantic flyers, who lose either themselves or their way, the more we admire Charles Lindbergh, who lost neither himself nor his way. J. H. H.

American Notes—The Connecticut Valley

(Editorial Correspondence.)

On the theory that what happened in the past helps to explain what is happening now, as well as to determine the course for the future, I am asking the reader to get his "American Notes" out of observations that were made while spending a few weeks in the Connecticut Valley. I am personally interested because a number of my ancestors had a hand in the doing of things a couple of hundred years ago. The people in that Valley had a lot to do with things democratic, a principle that I am today deeply concerned over. In fact, it would take little to get me to join a crusade for a revival of Americanism—real Americanism, that is opposed to all kinds of imperialism. To remember some of the things that occurred in the Connecticut Valley would help for a start. *Sovereignty of the people* in religion and government is the test of any Americanism worthy the name.

I have re-discovered Thomas Hooker of Hartford in my rambles. Something happened in that neighborhood nearly 300 years ago that marked a great step in popular government. Ten years after the pilgrims came to Plymouth, colonial matters were popping at the mouth of the Connecticut. The Dutch had pushed up from New Amsterdam (changed to New York, when the English persuaded them that they—the English—could govern better than the Dutch). The Indians—there were thousands of them—in the Valley were restless over the coming of the whites. A company of English had come down from Massachusetts to establish a town. The result was a company functioning at Hartford, with Rev. Thomas Hooker, the leading spirit, and a remarkable man. The question of a Plan of Union between the several settlements—places like Windsor and Wetherfield had sprung up—and in consequence, on the 14th of January, 1629, a plan of civil government was definitely formed, of which Hooker was the author.

For the first time in history the principles of democracy were put into statutory form. John Fiske says that it was the "first written constitution known to history that created a government, and it marked the beginning of American democracy," of which Hooker deserves more than any other to be called the father. "The government of the United States today," Fiske wrote 30 years ago, "is in lineal descent more nearly related to that of Connecticut than to that of any other of the 13 colonies."

And here are some of the principles that went into the statutes:

The basis of authority is laid in the free consent of the people.

The privilege of election belongs to the people.

They who have the power to appoint magistrates and officials—it is in their power also to set the bounds and limitations of the power and place into which they call them.

The Connecticut Constitution of 1639 is the earliest known suggestion of a fundamental law, enacted not by royal charter, nor by governor, but by the people themselves. That written constitution of popular government was Hooker's great work. Even in the New England colonies there had been a severe struggle over the principles of democracy and aristocracy. Connecticut, under Hooker's leadership, had stood for democracy. It was a victory of incalculable worth. This step preceded the Confederation of the States by 140

years. Parrington says, "While Roger Williams (great man) was engaged in erecting the democracy of Rhode Island, Thomas Hooker was as busily engaged in erecting the democracy of Connecticut." While Winthrop of Massachusetts held that the "judgment of the magistrate is the judgment of the Lord," Hooker replied, "I am afraid that is a course which wants both safety and warrant. It looks directly to tyranny and so to confusion . . . and I should choose neither to live nor to leave my posterity under such a government." He urged that foundation of government is the free consent of the people. In the Commonwealth there was to be no property qualification, no religious test regulating the right of franchise. Here are Hooker's ideas: 1. Compact theory of the state; 2. Popular sovereignty; 3. The state as a public-service corporation, responsible to the will of the majority.

When we recall that this was done in 1639, it is not difficult to come to the conclusion that I have, that the Connecticut Valley from Hartford and Windsor up to Northampton and Springfield has been a wonderful breeding place for ideas and institutions of democracy. Naturally, I am interested and pleased, for the church at Windsor played a good strong support to Hartford in efforts to secure democracy in civil and religious government. For did not my paternal ancestor, John Strong, have sense enough to come to America in 1630, and shortly after landing at Dorchester bring a growing family to Windsor, throwing in his lot with the church and John Warham, the pastor; and then a little later did not one of his sons, by name Return, slip into the parsonage and carry off Sarah Warham, for his wife, to become a distant great grandmother to me?

When I think of Thomas Hooker and his Constitution, I think of one American principle that was nailed down for us in 1639 at Hartford, the *sovereignty of the people in civil matters*. Of course, Mussolini has the front page today, and eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Another man who did his work around Northampton, Mass., nearly a century later than Hooker was Jonathan Edwards. I have been strolling around Northampton several days. I have felt the spell of this man Edwards. It is a little like, though different, the spell of Tolstoy or Gandhi; in fact, of all mystics. I know that this is the seat of the fine Smith's College and the home of Calvin Coolidge—but I confess I have thought more of Edwards than of all the rest of the town. He is rather baffling. The thought that now is uppermost is that, like Hooker, Edwards has been a great force for democracy in America, by helping to establish the sovereignty of the people in matters of religion. When America was being colonized the great job facing the colonists, though they often knew it not, was to throw off priest-craft and king-craft, and establish the sovereignty of the people in state and church. In other words, to establish *free* institutions.

While Hooker did a great piece of work at one end of the Valley for civic democracy, Edwards, in Northampton, did a great piece of work in helping to destroy any church establishment which for a long time threatened New England. He has been fitly called the "father of Congregationalism, or Independency." This means, of course, the sovereignty of the people in things religious.

In the first place, he was the greatest metaphysician in America for 150 years. He and Franklin were the only two Americans known in Europe the Revolution of 1776. He was the trail-blaze inspiration of the American revival movement. He not a sensationalist. No Moody or Sunday. He a mystic, and it is said that if he had stuck to his ph osophical idealism, he would have been a greater tha Emerson. People remember him because of a few sermons like "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," in which he consigned his hearers, many of them, t eternal doom, in a hell of fire.

I have a fascinating interest in him, partly because a relative of mine was ruling elder when he was ordained to the church at Northampton, and many other relatives were in the congregation; and then, admittedly, he exercised more power in New England than any other minister, and in those days the minister was the man of importance! One thing he did. He held up more powerfully than any other the sovereignty of God. All is determined by God. Here he was like Karl Marx in his doctrine of economic determinism—though in another realm. This preaching of divine sovereignty knocked the underpinning from all kinds of man imperialism, in state and church. He could, and did, make the king and pope look petty. With the doctrine of divine sovereignty, Edwards made the individual independent of God. This hastened the movement in New England for the separation of church and state.

Jonathan Edwards was not a man for sport-making. He had the highest respect for truth. He was like a scientist in his spirit and methods. He was engaged in processes and working not for effects. When he was meditating in the realm of idealism (and he was studying for 12 hours of the day) he was often wonderful. He was a strict disciplinarian, for himself and for others. He created, for his time, a new revivalistic method (lasting to this day) by exalting the experience of conversion as the central fact. He was a revolutionist, by assisting the forces that were driving the church and state apart. He was devoted to the God-idea. He felt compelled to build a universe about this idea.

The Great Awakening, a revival which he started, was noticed all over Europe. It stirred the colonial heart for three generations. The mass movement in it meant more prominence to the people. It destroyed Puritan formalism. It also broke down the parish system, and increased the growing protest against all hierarchy. A large number of itinerant preachers went about and became non-conformists. The Baptists and Methodists flourished. His insistence on conversion as the basis for communion gave a severe jolt to the established order of religion. He was unconsciously undermining the old order of the union of church and state, and as unconsciously became the leader for the exercise of local church authority on democratic principles.

As I consider the power that has gone from Northampton, with Edwards the chief exponent, that expressed itself in a demand for self-control and a high method of conduct, asserted the sovereignty of God and freedom in the conduct of meetings, emphasized conversion and the cultivation of the emotions of joy and peace—especially regarding the place given the common man in religion—it is difficult to withhold the belief that he has been, on the whole, a tremendous force for democracy. He seemed to leave no room for priests, and to him dominance over the souls of men by human authority would be unthinkable.

SYDNEY STRONG.

The Kellogg Proposal to Outlaw War

(*Chicago Tribune Radio Service*)

In 1914, Europe, and by 1917, practically the entire world were precipitated into a war that cost the lives of fifteen million of the best youth of the time and cost in money value 350 billion dollars. Thus the direct financial loss equaled in value the aggregate colossal wealth of the United States.

Now, first, how do we account for such a self-imposed calamity? For war is not an earthquake, or a volcanic eruption, or any violent outburst of nature. It is a hellish device unwittingly created by the hand of man.

And, secondly, what are we going to do to prevent the next war which, if half what the experts tell us is true, may blot out western civilization?

Well, first of all, what is this thing, war, that periodically ravages the world? You will all at once think of the definition given by General Sherman forty years ago that "War is hell." But one of our greatest statesmen, Charles Sumner, eighty years ago, in a masterly oration, said:

> War itself is hell, recognized, legalized, established, organized by the commonwealth of nations for the determination of international questions.

Thus it would seem as if mankind has come nearer getting rid of hell in the other world than here on earth.

War looks like a crime—indeed, like the sum of all crimes. But under our present international law it is no crime at all. Individually, or at retail, it is a crime to kill; collectively, or at wholesale, it is no crime to kill. War breaks all the Ten Commandments, but its operations are largely blessed by the holy church itself. Almost everybody denounces war in peace-time and supports it in war-time.

The plain fact is that we have inherited a Frankenstein. We have nurtured it for the purpose of protecting sovereignty and in very truth it now threatens to destroy all sovereignties. Why are we so helpless before this monster, this incubus? The quick answer is because war is lawful, is now and always has been recognized by international law as a proper and legal method of settling the disputes of the nations. It is therefore an institution created by the consent of nations to perform the function of a court in compelling settlements of international controversies—not a court of law, but a court of destruction and death. War would be bad enough and hard enough to cope with if it were not lawful; but as long as it is recognized and sheltered by international law, the problem of war is well-nigh insoluble. Civilization is beginning to see the light. It has scientifically diagnosed its malady. It has discovered the institutional character of war—its legality. When you say that a thing is an institution you necessarily say that it is lawful. Marriage is an institution; a college, a university, or a church is an institution; slavery, polygamy and dueling were institutions. Now, how has civilization gotten rid of other institutions that in course of time have become an intolerable nuisance? For example, piracy, international slave trade, dueling, domestic slavery, feuds, trial by battle, polygamy? These all flourished in their day, but each in its turn has been abolished. How has the abolition been accomplished? By force? By violence? By a war to end war? Not at all. No institution has ever been abolished by the use of force. Law and law alone can do it. The first thing that must be done with an institution that has become dangerous to society is to outlaw it, that is, make it unlawful, to cast it out of the fibre of law, and thus make it disreputable. Many attempts have been made the past 150 years to abolish or at least moderate the severity of war. But they have all suffered a like fate, though they have all been of educational value. Unless we take the prop of law from under war nothing effective can be done. For war has gotten completely out of control. Rules of war, laws of war, books of don'ts in war-time are scraps of paper indeed. The appeal to military necessity breaks down all law and all ethics.

Similarly regarding disarmament. It is almost idle to speak of drastic disarmament so long as war is a lawful resort, and really the supreme court of the nations. You might as well try to run a butcher shop without knives or cleavers as to run a war world without armaments. If it is lawful to go to war it is certainly lawful to have the best weapons of war obtainable.

But some representatives of the old order contend that if all war is outlawed the right of self-defense is taken away. This is a subtle and grievous error. The right of legitimate self-defense against sudden or wanton invasion or attack, in a nation as in an individual, cannot be taken away by any treaty or any law whatsoever. It is the deceptive use of the expression "defensive war" that makes the trouble. For example, all nations participating in the World War insisted and insist that they were fighting a defensive war. It takes history a long time to ascertain with any certainty who cast the first stone, that is, which is the aggressor nation. All nations must agree not to attempt to use force in connection with any dispute or controversy whatever. The abolishing of war as a method of settling disputes has no more to do with the inherent right of self-defense in a crisis than the flowers that bloom in the spring. When dueling was outlawed the inherent right of personal self-defense was not taken away and cannot be taken away. Dueling was an institution for the settlement of individual disputes of honor, just as war performs that function in the international sphere. We must cease to regard war as a legitimate court or method of adjusting controversies. Then its legitimacy will be gone, then it will die a natural death.

What we must do is to dethrone war from its seat of glory. It must be de-institutionalized, de-legalized, made a crime under the law of nations, outlawed, abolished.

It warms my American heart to know that the only thoroughgoing effort to abolish war as an institution, as a court, as a method of settling international disputes, has been made by our own country and tendered to the world within the past few months. I refer of course to the Kellogg proposal to outlaw war dated February 27, 1928, which goes to the root of the matter and refuses to be diverted by diluting adjectives and weasel-worded ambiguities. In short, our administration has proposed to join with France in offering a treaty to the nations of the world condemning and dis-

avowing recourse to war as a method of settling disputes. The following thrilling language is used in the Kellogg proposal:

> From the broad standpoint of humanity and civilization all war is an assault upon the stability of human society and should be suppressed in the common interest. The government of the United States desires to see the institution of war abolished.

This proposal had its origin in a declaration of M. Briand to the American people on April 6, 1927, the tenth anniversary of our entrance into the Great War. The proposal is epoch-making, is bound to become the greatest revolution in history and is sweeping the world like a prairie fire. The proposal is not to disarm. That can only come after war has been successfully outlawed. The proposal is not to submit all controversies to arbitration. There are certain national and domestic questions which no nation should be asked to arbitrate. The proposal is that in no event will any nation resort to force or violence in an attempt to settle any controversy whatever. It doesn't follow that because you won't arbitrate you must kill. Take, for example, our immigration question with Japan. We will not arbitrate it, but, in God's name, of what use would it be to have a war between the United States and Japan over that controversy? How would it settle the immigration question? It would only make matters and relations infinitely worse. The thing to do is for each nation to leave the other alone and let time work the solution. The essence of the outlawry treaty proposed by Secretary Kellogg is that no nation will attempt to interfere with the rights or claims of another nation, except by peaceable means. This puts international relations upon the basis of the plighted word and it is interesting to observe that the plighted word is as far as you can get in the dealings between nations. A military a is based upon the plighted word. The Locarno T is based upon the plighted word. The League Nations is based upon the plighted word. All treat all compacts between nations are based upon t plighted word. If the plighted word is good for wa why is it not equally good for peace? And if there is no faith in the world we might as well settle down to the doom of war and do the best we can to postpone the coming of the doom.

But I cannot close without revealing my real optimism. The tremendous value of the Kellogg proposal to all the nations to join in a treaty outlawing war cannot be exaggerated. Its momentum is becoming irresistible. This proposal is making its rapid way in Europe. The lightning change of sentiment there is crisply stated in an excerpt from a European newspaper cabled here last Monday. It reads:

> The outlawing of war is one of those foolish ideas that remain foolish until realized. Three months ago it appeared to most people as absolutely crazy, but today it dominates the entire problem of foreign diplomacy.

The Kellogg proposal furnishes a common ground upon which all groups of peace advocates the world over can consistently and harmoniously stand. It deals with a fundamental proposition and it is a test upon the peoples of the world. Do the people want peace, or do they want to retain war? I have an abiding faith in the answer. But the way is long and it is the duty of everyone, without regard to party, to support and encourage our administration in its noble effort to abolish war. For thus and thus only can we redeem the promise of the World War and recompense for its gigantic cost.

SALMON O. LEVINSON.

We Hail You, Mother India!

What makes Miss Mayo's book such a tragic phenomenon of our time are not alone the hasty generalizations of her untrained mind, the juggling with a few facts torn out of historic perspective and viciously handled. It is the more important matter that the widespread publicity given her slanderous book on three continents should occur at a time when the growing sense of world-amity and international good-will is becoming more and more vocal in the hearts of all mankind. As a disunifying force, at such an hour in the time-process, it should merit for its author universal rebuke.

The internal evidence in support of her wholesale indictment of a great people—with a tradition of culture and civilization such as to command the admiration of a Max Muller—is of such an unreliable and unauthenticated nature that were its only result the apparent psychological release which it gives the author, one would be justified in throwing it into the consuming fire. But a book which raises the international tension to the fever-point, slanders 320 millions of people, and leaves a greater legacy of hatred, recrimination and falsehood than was in the world before it appeared, is not to be dismissed so lightly. Again, if the only accusation against Miss Mayo were one of generalizing on insufficient data—ever the besetting sin of the unscientific mind—then one could readily afford to throw over her non-professional nudity the mantle of the broadest charity. But more and other than all this is the vicious Mayo attitude, the undisguised vindictiveness of this sanitary inspector (to quote Gandhi) of the drains and sewers of Mother India, who, in spite of her declaration that she is "uncommitted, unsubsidized and unattached," has all the airs of a mediaeval Christian protagonist and the familiar over-tones of a British Imperialist. Miss Mayo, apparently driven by the whip of immediate necessity to defend herself, has given the concentrated essence of her inner spirit in one sentence, which I take from her article in *Liberty*, January 14th: "Keep away, Mrs. John, from the Swamis, the Yogis, the teaching men. You would need no such bidding if, for an instant, you guessed the truth." Was a viler generalization ever made in print against a race of men and women who have, through the ages, achieved a peak of spirituality which, for its vastness, humbles the Himalayas? In this article, as in her book, she foists on her unsuspecting public a picture of 'one of the thousands of Holy Men in whom India abounds.' But a glance at it reveals the fact that he is one of the commonest of street charlatans whom no Hindu ever dignifies with the distinction of a holy man. On the adjoining page is a map of India accompanied by the information that of the 320 millions of population, 92 per cent are illiterate. Mr. H. M. Wyndham, himself a Britisher, tells us that "out of the total revenue raised in British India, we spend only one penny per head on

on and only one per cent of the population goes ool." This, be it emphasized, is in British India, eas in the native states of Baroda, Mysore, and lesser extent in Travencore, all boys of school-age under instruction, because there, unlike in British ndia, education is free and, for the most part, com-ulsory. If British India has not been the enemy of education, neither has it been its apostle. No, it needs too much money to support a foreign army on an alien soil, and a governmental administration 7,000 miles from the arena of affairs!

Her chief source-book for Mother India is given in a footnote as "Hindu Customs, Manners and Ceremonies," by the Abbe Dubois, Clarendon Press, 1924. Why does Miss Mayo not tell her unknowing public that the Abbe Dubois died in 1848, instead of the wholly misleading reference to the 1924 edition of an unauthenticated work by this Catholic Padre? Is it honest for Miss Mayo to indict a whole nation with the most unmentionable crimes on the reports of an avowed opponent of the Brahmin, plus a few facts hastily gathered on a five months' tour under the aegis of British Official India, and among a people who are a combination of diverse nationalities, only to exude the whole as if it were a situation which materialized since the national aspirations of India found a voice in the recent uprisings in Bengal? If Miss Mayo is, as she says, "unsubsidized, uncommitted and unattached," how could she fail to report the historical linkages in the political agitation in India during the past twenty years, and which took organized form with the notorious partition of Bengal on a religious basis under the most tyrannical of Viceroys, Lord Curzon? Not only does Miss Mayo shut her eyes to the historicity of this movement but she tells us that the Hindus, because they are sexually exhausted at thirty, find in political agitation and terrorism a substitute for the lack of normal avenues of sex-expression. It does not seem to trouble Miss Mayo to explain how a nation of impotent men, physically undone years before their prime, without initiative enough to engineer a way of life for themselves, can nevertheless have the fire of courage left in them to bring Britannia almost to her knees, and produce a race of publicists who have the hardihood to rot in the marsh-holes of prisons of Bengal!

Again, when one attempts to verify her references to the ancient scriptures of India—The Vedas—it is only to find that she is quoting from The Puranas, a centuries-later accretion of mythologies grafted on the original by her horned-devil, the Brahmin. There is not, as far as I can verify, a single quotation taken directly from The Vedas. Is her object to discredit, at their fountain-head, the ancient culture and civilization of the Hindus? It is well for India, in the Western World, that Max Muller made his notable appreciation of the Hindu Scriptures fifty years before Miss Mayo was born! Further, it is never Miss Mayo's habit to quote anything *verbatim et literatim.* She does not do it even with her references to the Abbe Dubois. She is, at the best, an expert paraphraser, because it enables her to make a situation more real than it is, and more like the sordid story which she set out to tell when she left America. Wherever I have exposed her, in churches, before college women's clubs, the same insistent question arises—Why did she do it? She, an American woman of independent means, and author of a book on the Philippines, with an introduction written by Lionel Curtis, "the father of the present Dyarchical Government" in India! Why did she do it? As if there could be but one answer when the reader recalls her entente cordiale with the India Office in London, how this branch of the British Foreign Office graciously obliged her with data, which she confesses greatly facilitated the writing of the book, and that while she is malicious toward the Brahmin caste, she seldom misses an opportunity to sing the Te Deum in praise of the new governing caste—the British Overlords! As a liturgical response, I quote the words of Sir W. Joynson-Hicks, Home-Secretary in the Baldwin Cabinet: "We did not conquer India for the benefit of the Indians. We conquered India as an outlet for the goods of Great Britain. We conquered India by the sword, and by the sword we shall hold her."

The most sensational features of the book can be disposed of without much difficulty. Child-marriage in India is confined to the Brahmin Community, and at that to a small percentage of Brahmins, and is never anything else but a betrothal. The marriage is never consummated until the girl reaches maturity which Miss Mayo, after her usual fashion, omits to tell us is years earlier in the Orient than it is in the Occident. At that, according to a statistical report by Dr. Balfour of the Madras Maternity hospital, covering the years 1922-1924, the average age of almost three thousand mothers is 19.4 and not as Miss Mayo has it, "fourteen is well above the average." In this connection, it would be interesting to hear Miss Mayo's explanation of the fact, stated by Mrs. Besant, that when a post-puberty marriage-bill was introduced into the Madras Legislature by a Brahmin, the strongest opposition came from British Official India. Again, Miss Mayo's statements as to the sexual prostitution of the male Hindu child are not documented, and her half-truths spun around the early life of Gandhi pollute one of the few saintly figures the modern world knows. Why did she not tell us that it was the religion of the Hindus (whom, as usual, she maligns and misrepresents, calling them "the silly Hindus") which was indeed the bit and bridle upon his youthful passions, and, at an age, when most American youths are still riding the fiery steed—if Judge Lindsay's exposê of our own situation is to be believed! It was, indeed, his religion, fed to him with his mother's milk, which ultimately enabled him to conquer "Kama and Krodha—the tiger and ape" birthed in him by nature.

Miss Mayo's heart bleeds over the Untouchables. Well it may, and for more reasons than she mentions! The degradation of these God-forsaken and British-forsaken wretches is all she says it is. But the lady does not see that she has written the severest condemnation of the governing caste whom she would have us believe is doing all that is being done for the welfare of sad old Mother India. One cannot but wonder why she is so silent over the near-untouchables, the peasant class who form the bulk of India's vast population. Why does she not deplore the lot of the Indian farmer —130 millions of them—who lives in the direst poverty and filth, and never knows, any more than does the Untouchable, what it is to have his hunger assuaged once in a year? Why, indeed, did she not go before the court of world-opinion concerning the fate meted out to them by the British government when it cut the main artery of India's livelihood by a tariff act which enabled the Lancashire manufacturer to undersell the Indian producer? At one blow, this vast body of British subjects in India was reduced to an economic slavery,

which has no parallel anywhere in the modern world. Miss Mayo grows generously pious whenever it comes to the attitude of British official India toward the religious taboos and social customs of her subjects. Strange, is it not, that Britain knows no such reverence when big commercial prizes are the game, and the continued existence of millions of people is the stake? The author of "Mother India" is just too ignorant of sociological and biological sciences to know the intimate relationship between poverty and procreation. She will have it (to prove her sensational theory that all of India's woes are due to an early exhausted sex-life) that the high infant mortality is a resultant of venereal disease, which is universal in India, and that all Hindu women have either one or both diseases. She does not know that the common name for venereal disease in India shows that it is of European origin, and the further fact that since most of India's millions live in villages, it cannot be as widespread as in this country or Europe with their teeming city populations. According to Sir William Hunter, forty millions of people in India go through life with only one meal a day. According to Sir Charles Elliott, seventy millions do not know what it is to be free from hunger once in a year. Well may we ask if the high infant mortality of India is not largely due to this awful poverty, with the ever-increasing impoverishment of the resisting-power in the daily struggle for existence.

Nor is Miss Mayo more truthful in her pic the life of India's women under the Purdah syste is not as widespread as she indicates, and in the of India it is practically unknown except among M lem women. Her undisguised regard for the Mos evidently prevented her from telling us that the Purd has no sanction in the Vedas, and that it was first intr duced among the Hindu women, as a defensive mechan ism to protect their chastity at the time of the Mohammedan conquest. Social progress is as slow of foot in India as it is anyhere else. What else can we expect when her leading publicists, political and social reformers are either driven into the jungle as wild beasts, or else thrown into jail for being (as they say in official India) "prejudicial to public safety"?

All in all, it may be that Miss Mayo has done a yeoman's service to India that is beyond her intention as it is beyond her recompense. She has aroused a world-wide interest in this vast Colonial possession of the British Empire which will, as the real facts are unveiled, hasten the day of India's liberation. Meanwhile, we Humanists of America stretch our hands across the seas to "sad old Mother India." Her struggle is our struggle: her hopes are our hopes, for all mankind. We hail you, Mother India—Bharata Varsha—whose shining parapets point to the eternal summer of the human race. *Om Mane Padme Hum!*

EUGENE MILNE COSGROVE.

Christian Agnosticism

Shelley called himself an atheist in order to raise the standard of rebellion against the bigotry of the Christian Church of his day. Coleridge said, "That young man calls himself an atheist but he is really a pantheist." Shelley's lofty faith was too volatile for any pigeonhole, and in this day of wistful searching our purest faiths are still the most difficult to define. Agnosticism is harder to defend than out and out atheism. It stands between the mechanistic position and the liberal modernist position. It is misunderstood and discredited by both left and right, but the number of its adherents is growing so large that it may well hold the seeds of the religion of the future.

The members of this faith have wiped theology off the slate, but they refuse to worship the god of the intelligentsia, human intellect. They refuse to admit that fact is synonymous with truth. They have seen science retract its findings too many times to be devotees of science. They have seen the coldest intellect biased by emotion too many times to have absolute faith in intellect. They consider intuition as well as reason and they believe that imagination and even desire are aids in the search for truth. They do not stop at knowing. They love to wonder.

These believers are intrigued by the unknown and the invisible. They tease their fancies with the undiscovered possibilities of magnetic influence, of wave-lengths and of mental telepathy. They know that with all its fox fires, imagination has been the path finder not only of poetry and art but also of science. They claim that great scientific discoveries have always been made by men who "dream dreams and see visions."

They cannot believe in a personal God, in an extraneous Being who made the Universe. To them God *is* the Universe. They believe that the supernatural is only nature not yet understood and to them matter and spirit are one. They do not use the word revelation but they believe in inspiration. They are conscious of something apparently outside of ourselves, which strengthens and stimulates and comforts. They have found that its fund of energy can be tapped as a reservoir is tapped. They do not know its origin but they know its results, and they call it spirit. They see spiritual, mental and even physical health come through communion with this mysterious galvanizing force, and not from authority but from experiment and experience they believe in prayer. They vary in their ideas of immortality, but belief in no form of it is essential. It is not important to them. They neither know nor care about the next world. They want fulness of life in this world, life on the spiritual plane and commitment to the far values. They are content with sleep, "when the long trick's over."

Agnostics are called atheists by the orthodox, and ambiguous by the atheists. They sympathize with the intellectual honesty of the latter, but they feel a pathetic limitation in their consciousness. To them "unbelievers" seem like tone deaf people who ridicule music. These believers are seldom church-goers, for they only feel at home in the few churches where no creeds are said and where the sermons are human rather than theological. But they do feel a strong bond of sympathy with even the most ignorant and superstitious group which gathers to hear the words of Christ. For whether he be God, man, or myth, to them Jesus of Nazareth is the human ideal. Like Renan they believe

to be still the way to save the world from ess and materialism. In that sense he is still the of mankind.

Carl Van Doren in a recent essay in *The Forum* azine claims that the greatest believers in the past ve been the greatest tyrants. Unlike Mr. Van Doren, ey believe that it is lack of real Christian faith rather an excess of it which has rent the world with wars nd oppression. They know that it would be an impossible task to really estimate the beneficence and the tyranny of believers and unbelievers in the past, because so many of the leaders of the church were skeptics at heart and because many branded atheists, like Shelley, are now considered among the great believers. But they claim that the most winning figures of history, Francis of Assisi, Joan of Arc, Abraham Lincoln, and countless others have been the firmest believers in the ideals of Jesus and the most devout worshippers of that spirit which "leads into the way of Truth."

MILDRED W. STILLMAN.

The Study Table

A Plea for Outlawry

Commander Kenworthy has written in this book* one more indictment of war. To those familiar with the present European situation, it will be no surprise to read in these pages that the next war is on the way; nor to readers of books like Will Irwin's "The Next War" will it seem strange to hear that this next war will surpass the last war in destruction and horror beyond all words to describe. These theses are become a tragic commonplace to informed and intelligent minds these days, and Commander Kenworthy's testimony, impressive throughout, is only the latest voice in what is rapidly becoming a chorus of voices.

This book, however, opens up new ground, or at least develops old ground hitherto neglected, for not altogether unimaginable reasons, in its chapters on "Why an Anglo-American War Is Possible," and "The United States versus the British Empire. Probable Course of War." Commander Kenworthy sees and states what other writers have seen and mostly avoided, that America and England are today the two great international rivals in the modern world, that there are disastrous influences in both nations making for the psychology that breeds war, that competition in armaments, despite the Washington Conference, is as menacing between these two powers as ever it was between England and Germany, and that if ultimate war is to be prevented, it must be prevented *now* by mobilizing on both sides of the ocean the peace-loving sentiments of the people. This is vital not only for these two countries but also for the world at large, for "the key to world peace is friendship between Great Britain and the United States of America." Lose this key, and all is lost!

But the notable aspect of this book is not its recognition nor yet its depiction of the international situation and the looming prospect of another war. Rather is it the remedy suggested, the program presented! H. G. Wells, in his "Foreword," remarks that "in his culminating chapter, 'The Only Road,' he (the author) does a little seem to fade." But we cannot agree! On the contrary, it is just in this "culminating chapter" that Commander Kenworthy rises to the full height of his great argument. Early in his book he places his finger on the fact which has paralyzed all organized peace work to date—namely, that "war is still a recognized and legal institution." Midway in his book, he shows that any attempt to deal with the monstrous evil of armed conflict runs flat up against the fact that war's "legality and justification (are) accepted as a matter of course." Kenworthy has glimpsed the central truth, in other words, of the whole war situation—that we are living inside a system of arms—legalized, institutionalized, sanctified—and that until we disestablish this system, nothing effectual can be done for peace. His understanding of the situation that is, is precisely that of the Outlawry of War advocates in this country, so it is not surprising to find "the only road" from war to peace which he can discover is "Outlawry!"

"Great changes in the institutions of the world," he writes, "are brought about by the gradual development of the human mind. Slavery, the tribal blood-feud, the vendetta, the wars of religion, the feudal system with its private armies and private wars, the personal duel, were all firmly established and looked upon as perfectly legitimate. . . . They have all been swept into the limbo of forgotten or discredited institutions by the evolution in public opinion. . . . Under modern conditions warfare has become an intolerable nuisance to the whole world. I am convinced that the vast majority of civilized people would welcome the necessary action to supplement the revolution in outlook by *outlawing war*. . . . War must be recognized for what it is, a stupid, useless and indefensible crime."

In surveying plans of Outlawry, Commander Kenworthy gives due place and credit to Senator Borah's now world famous Resolution. This, or something very like it, is "the only road" to peace. This volume, "Peace or War," must be placed side by side with Dr. Morrison's "The Outlawry of War," as a second mighty contribution to the great cause.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

*Peace or War, by J. M. Kenworthy, with an introduction by H. G. Wells. Published by Boni and Liveright. $2.50.

Short Stories by Zona Gale

The obvious thing to say about these stories† is the point that has been made in the journals. They are marvels of condensation. The author has presented in less than a thousand words more than one life and given the effect of a novel. You see the character complete. You see the incident that holds the entire life the way a seed miraculously holds the stem, the fruit, and the green. But condensation is not a remarkable thing in itself and the power behind these stories is not the gift of selection or the perfection of technique. It is Miss Gale's ability to divide all lives, no matter how complicated, into two parts, the mechanical and the essential. There is Elmer Dasher hearing a cry from the engine of his car, listening because it is unlike anything he has ever heard before, and feeling all the time a small, new life in him turning like a miracle in his throat and eye. It is this fire, this essential flame, that burns and shines through the perfection of words

†Yellow Gentians and Blue, by Zona Gale. Published by D. Appleton and Company. $2.00.

and images until we know which part of us is the living and which is the dead.

"The Two Souls" has more of this substance than either "A Far Cry" or "The Biography of Blade." It has a certain crude newness about it while the other two have a fine finish and are complete as stories. There is another point about "The Two Souls." After Marthella and Malcolm have insulted each other something happens to them. "There was Malcolm, as she knew him, but shot through with some incalculable cast of radiance. His face was serene and beautiful—not as she remembered it in his youth, not as she might imagine it in death, but all compounded of both, and majestic beyond the faces of men." They both see the perfect form that stands behind all women and all men, perhaps it is the ideal design that they see. And then they do not revert to the mechanical, but adjust themselves to a greater glory than the one they have just experienced, to the earth which suddenly becomes their home, to the sun which will always mean light, to their love which at last has become a fusion of the ideal and the real. As you read you hear soft sounds among the words as if a bird were turning and rising, you can almost see the white body of a dove and the new, startled look in its eye.

According to the following interpretation of "In the Lobby," this story presents another aspect of Miss Gale's work. Bruce loves the image of his wife and dares not love another because he i would be a betrayal. He cannot imagine himself t another wife any more than most people can ima taking another mother. But he wants his three child to be properly brought up so he selects the plump Ann On the way to Anna's house everything is tinged wi the way he is seeing himself. Here the fine imager and lyricism is not used for its own sake but for th enrichment of character and psychology.

Streams of air tore through the darkness, their thin spray switching and stinging, and from inner coverts broke and regathered a thin roar as from some ambiguous beast too old and worn to care to roar. From the core of the cold blew an odor of clean, far plains, tended by the sweep of snow and the killing quality of frost, an odor like the odor of frozen furrows, the pang of spring.

My entire criticism of the story lies in the intention. I want to know that Bruce's complacent irony—"this love business is not enough"—is really his own psychology and I want to feel that the author knows why love is not enough for this man who is incapable of loving again. Certainly the handling is admirable, but after you have finished it you feel that a story without deep purpose, without the vitality to make life a privilege instead of a doom, is something like life or love without purpose—it is "not enough."

MARGERY LATIMER.

Correspondence

Women in the Campaign

Editor of UNITY:

In common, I am sure, with many women, I read with interest a recent article in the Boston *Herald* on "Women in the Campaign." The *Herald* expresses surprise that the women of the country did not make themselves more strongly felt in the national party conventions in 1924, as they had then become enfranchised, and that there is slight evidence of their active interest in the approaching conventions at Kansas City and Houston. The surprise seems to me to show a naive disregard of the slowness with which all great political advances organize and institutionalize themselves. In view of the fact that the experienced men of the country, in whose hands the party machinery has been so long entrenched that it is still a vested interest, are mournfully without program and purpose as the conventions approach, the fact that the proportion of women delegates will be so much less than the proportion in the electorate is only what should be expected. Under our present machinery, multitudes of men feel as if their votes were almost thrown away. It is to be hoped that in the next four years this machinery will be thoroughly overhauled, and that the voting of both men and women will consequently be nearer what it ought to be. I look for vastly more interest in the next election than in the last; and if its results bring any real inspiration and outlook, there will be some ground for the expectation and demand that half the delegates at the convention of 1932 be women. Meantime, there may be something in the *Herald's* guess that the women are "too wise to begin shouting before there is anything or anybody to shout about."

A further guess that in the election of 1924 some women were interested in the success of Mr. Coolidge "because Mrs. Coolidge was such an awfully nice woman" is not so good. Women are not so much interested as men in the personalities of politics. We are witnessing this masculine absorption at this time. It is certainly desirable that the social life at the White House shall be influenced by noble and able women, like Mrs. Coolidge or Mrs. Hoover; but that is not a momentous issue. What is momentous is that we shall have opportunity to vote for great and commanding principles and worthy candidates. Women, the women who count, are enthusiastic over causes; and a cardinal reason why they do not "shout" over current party activities is that the great parties as such are frittering away their strength on personalities and petty jealousies and paying no respectable attention to the commanding causes which cry for their backing. President Butler spoke tart and timely truth in his recent speech in New York when he said that the names of the two major political parties have today become mere trademarks, which means that neither is animated by any great distinctive, vital or urgent purpose. If the men either at Kansas City or Houston will show some faint desire to change this, the women will be ready enough to help them "shout."

The thoughtful women of the country, as I meet them, are not asking whether "Al" Smith's wife is a "nice woman" or where she goes to church. They are asking whether "Al" Smith's party, or its rival, proposes to put a stop to our "policing" at fabulous cost to the tax-payers a nation like Nicaragua, sending our fine boys into the jungle by the thousand to be killed by the score, in the process of killing Nicaraguans by the hundred under the pretense of protecting American life and property in the real effort to maintain in power a subservient minority government; whether we are to go on spending, as Secretary Mellon tells us we are doing, 82 percent of our federal revenue on war and armaments; whether the present big navy insanity at Washington is to be stopped; whether we are to continue to hamper by high tariffs the trade with us of the European countries, who only by trade can earn the wherewithal to pay their debts; and whether we are to continue to stand aloof from the organized family of nations.

A fitting candidate for the presidency, representing the spirit here urged, would be Herbert Hoover—in my judgment and that of multitudes of thoughtful women, the *best* candidate. He knows the world and its broad interests, as Mr. Coolidge did not, and he would never betray those high interests, as Mr. Coolidge has done in the case both of the League of Nations and the World Court.

Only the height of folly can make Republican defeat this year possible, but that is a folly of which men have proved themselves quite capable. It would be easy to give the election to Alfred Smith, who has strong human appeals and whose election would bring to some the wholesome satisfaction of witnessing a rebuke to the dragging of religious issues into our politics. But Governor Smith, with his undeniably great executive ability, has, so far as I can discover, no distinctive or considerable program. His letter to the Jackson dinner at Washington

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

ELLA BOYNTON

In the death of Ella Boynton, on April 13, following an operation for appendicitis, Chicago lost one of her noblest and most useful citizens. Endowed with a clear intellect and a warm heart, plans for civic betterment and happier social conditions won her immediate sympathy and support.

As president of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, her tireless work in the interest of peace was known internationally. Time and strength were never counted in her devotion to this great cause.

In conjunction with her sister, Miss Alice Boynton, their home has been the gathering place for young people who love to flock there to enjoy its atmosphere of culture, friendliness and understanding. Young and old have alike felt the charm of its simplicity and sincerity. One came away with a saner outlook on life, a sense of what a home might be, helped by just having been there.

While we mourn the loss of Ella Boynton, valiant soul, gentle friend, we rejoice in her life richly lived, freely spent in the service of all mankind. She made a great investment which will bring returns through all the years to come. E. Ll. J.

American Writers Felicitate Maxim Gorky on 60th Birth Anniversary

(See UNITY, April 9, page 121)

Maxim Gorky, Sorrento, Italy

In the name of American Writers and Artists we greet you upon your 60th anniversary as a genius of world literature and as a prophet among men.

We are happy to find you on this anniversary, which is also the 35th anniversary of your creative genius, so vigilant, with efforts triumphant, so vital a force in the new Russia, in the strife for whose freedom you always were and remain the illustrious and faithful champion.

Our hearty and sincere wishes for many more happy and fruitful years.

(Signed): Alexander Archipenko, Roger Baldwin, Gregory Breitman, David D. Burliuk, Henry Seidel Canby, Nicholas Cickovsky, Prof. John Erskine, Boris Glagolin, Gousieff-Orenbursky, John Haynes Holmes, Fannie Hurst, Prof. V. Karapetoff, Harry Kemp, Abraham Manevich, Daniel Gregory Mason, H. L. Mencken, New Playwrights Theatre, Lyddia Nadejena, Albertina Rasch, Burton Rascoe, Oliver Sayler, Serge Soudeikine, Prof. Leo Theremin, D. Tiomkin, Oswald Garrison Villard, William Allen White, Theodore Dreiser, Edgar Lee Masters, Konrad Bercovici, Upton Sinclair, Stuart Chase, Norman Hapgood, Sherwood Anderson, John Dewey, James Rorty, John Macy, Edward Arlington Robinson, David Starr Jordan, Herman Bernstein, Benjamin Nikulin.

PROGRAM

Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting
of the
NATIONAL CHILD LABOR COMMITTEE
Memphis, Tennessee
May 4, 1928

Session I

Luncheon, Claridge Hotel
One o'Clock

"Hazards of Juvenile Employment"

"The Year in Review." Presiding officer: Homer Folks, Acting Chairman, Board of Trustees, National Child Labor Committee.

"Health Hazards of Child Labor." Dr. Richard Bolt, Department of Child Hygiene, University of California.

"Educational Opportunity vs. Child Labor." Dr. John A. Lapp, Professor of Sociology, Marquette University.

"Industry and the Youthful Workers." Dr. Alice Hamilton, Associate Professor, Industrial Medicine, Harvard Medical School.

Session II

Auditorium, Room 3
Three o'Clock

"Child Labor in 1928"

Presiding Officer: Rev. F. Ernest Johnson, Executive Secretary, Department of Research and Education, Federal Council of Churches.

"Child Labor: Past and Present." Miss E. N. Matthews, Director of Industrial Division, Federal Children's Bureau.

"Problems of Legislation." John B. Andrews, Secretary, American Association of Labor Legislation.

"Our Part in the Social Program." Wiley H. Swift, Acting General Secretary, National Child Labor Committee.

DISCUSSION:

"Child Labor in the South." Mrs. A. M. Tunstall, Director, State Child Welfare Department of Alabama.

"The Rural Child." Charles E. Gibbons, Director, Department of Investigation, National Child Labor Committee.

National Child Labor Committee

Officers: Samuel McCune Lindsay, Chairman; Homer Folks and William Draper Lewis, Vice-Chairmen; Joseph R. Swan, Treasurer, and Wiley H. Swift, Acting General Secretary.

Board of Trustees

Felix Adler, Trustee Emeritus; Jane Addams, Leo Arnstein, Mrs. John C. Breckinridge, Francis G. Caffey, R. J. Caldwell, Noel T. Dowling, Haven

---

certainly revealed none. Mr. Hoover's whole life and work and aims proclaim a program. Is he not clearly the man for the hour? The decision of the Scripps-Howard great chain of newspapers to support Mr. Hoover, and failing him to get behind Governor Smith, to which the *Herald* directs attention, is very significant. So is the *Herald's* recent review of the tributes of the New York *World*, the leading Democratic paper of the country, to Mr. Hoover as the man pre-eminently fitted for the presidency. Why not make it unanimous? Why not, then, an "era of good feeling," with extravagant and fictitious party strife reduced to its proper place, and with men like John W. Davis and Newton D. Baker, along with Republicans, in the cabinet? By 1932, the Democratic party might come to its senses and create an Opposition, a real Progressive party based on something, which is a crying need. With our politics once made significant, the reflection of the realities and aspirations in the hearts of the people, there is not the slightest doubt of the earnest activity of the women or of their "shouting" as much as is good for them or for their brothers. LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Boston, Mass.

A Monument to John Brown

Editor of UNITY:

A group of men and women are banded into an organization known as the Frederick Douglass Chapter of the John Brown Memorial Association, the object of which is to erect a monument to the memory of John Brown.

This wonderful character gave his all for Human Freedom in America. This appeal is issued in an effort to interest 25,000 men and women who appreciate this supreme sacrifice in their behalf to subscribe $1.00 toward this purpose. Every individual on earth considers himself appreciative, and it is unbelievable that a human could give his all to aid others and then be forgotten by those so benefited. History does not record since the Christian era a sacrifice so noble, so absolute, so inspiring, so beneficial as that made by John Brown. His deeds cannot be forgotten nor shall the world longer have a single doubt as to the appreciation of those in whose behalf this supreme sacrifice was made. We must, we shall, erect a monument to his memory, and will do it from the dimes and dollars of those who appreciate.

Send your contributions to the Chairman of the Monument Fund, Mr. W. H. Wortham, 328 Lenox Ave., or the Rev. William Lloyd Imes, 206 West 137th Street, the president of our New York Chapter. Do not let your name be left off this *Golden List* of contributors to so worthy a cause.

Frederick Douglass Chapter
The John Brown Memorial Association, Inc.
DR. J. MAX BARBOR, National President
Rev. Wm. Lloyd Imes, President of Chapter
206 West 137th Street, New York City.

Emerson, Charles H. Frazier, William E. Harmon, Mrs. Charles E. Heming, Alfred Jaretzki, Jr., F. Ernest Johnson, Mrs. M. J. Kaufmann, Adolph Lewisohn, Grace M. Lichten, E. C. Lindeman, Owen R. Lovejoy, V. Everit Macy, George H. Richards, Henry W. Thurston, Lillian D. Wald, Paul M. Warburg, Stephen S. Wise, Mark Wiseman and John W. Wood.

SOCIAL REFORM IN INDIA

Social Congress Resolutions (India)

The following are the resolutions recently passed by the Indian Social Conference:

1. Social Legislation—This Conference expresses its firm belief that the time has now come for the State to address itself boldly and comprehensively to the task of social legislation, regrets the painfully slow rate at which social legislation has been undertaken in the past and expresses it as its considered opinion that legislative measures undertaken so far have been at the best haphazard, ineffective and half-hearted and urges on this Conference the realization of the fact that the best way of enhancing and accelerating social progress could only be by the Legislative Councils and Assemblies developing into fully and truly National bodies.

2. Untouchability — This Conference views with grave apprehension the continuation of the practice of untouchability in India and exhorts Hindus of all classes to remove all restrictions imposed upon the so-called "untouchables" in the matter of admission to schools, colleges and hostels, use of public roads, wells and tanks and entry into places of worship and thus bring about a greater solidarity in Hindu society, and it pledges its full support to these classes for every proper effort by them to get rid of these evils.

3. Prohibition — This Conference views with satisfaction the growth of public opinion in favor of total abstinence and prohibition, and is of opinion that the time is ripe for legislation prohibiting the manufacture, import and sale of liquor and intoxicating drugs in all forms and expresses its approval of efforts made in this direction by associations like the All-India Prohibition League.

4. Intercaste Marriage—This Conference is of opinion that a simple Civil Marriage Act without any inquisitorial declaration regarding religious belief be passed.

This Conference further urges upon the Legislatures the removal of all disabilities in the way of inheritance that hinder the spread of inter-marriages between members of different castes and communities.

The Carpenter of Heaven

'Mid piles of timber, new and raw,
A workman shapes earth's spars;
Bright dust spurts from His sliding saw,
The sky is strewn with stars.

KENNETH W. PORTER

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove

Tel. Atlantic 1876

THE HIGH SIERRAS CALL!

Visit the uninhabited mountain regions of California, loved by John Muir.

Leave civilization behind for two, four, six weeks.

Join a congenial camping and hiking party in charge of two teachers, readers of UNITY. Forget newspapers, telephones, radios, autos.

Enjoy fishing, pack trains, camp fires, companionship.

For full information address

Elmo A. Robinson
Box 719
Menlo Park, Cal.

IN APRIL

Comes Easter as the signal for introducing your clothes of a new season. Spring demands an appropriate wardrobe—and there is no greater economy to be practiced than the use of our service which so expertly cleanses and freshens each previously worn garment that you send us.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0331 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

THE AMERICAN SCHOOLS IN THE OLD WORLD

CHATEAU DE BURES

Par Villennes, Seine et Oise, France
A Country Boarding School to prepare Boys for American Colleges

PARIS AMERICAN DAY SCHOOL

57 Rue Boileau, Paris. For Boys and Girls under 12. Both Schools—Modern and Progressive Methods—American and Foreign Masters
For information address Box 675, Amherst, Mass.

PRAYERS

By JENKIN LLOYD JONES
Published by The Beacon Press, Boston, Mass.
Price $1.50

"A choice collection of the lyrical and inspiring prayers that sprang with such spontaneity from the heart and soul of Jenkin Lloyd Jones."—C. W. R.

"Beautiful, simple, dignified, spiritual. I do not know when I have been so impressed."—H. S. N.

"Tender, wonderfully human and wonderfully comforting and uplifting."—J. T. S.

"When life runs deep below the surface, the abiding faith in love and justice and the tender enfolding Fatherhood voiced in these prayers will bring comfort and courage."—O. C. S.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN CENTRE,
730 Oakwood Boulevard,
Chicago.

I enclose $.....for.....copies of Prayers by Jenkin Lloyd Jones.

NAME .....

STREET .....

CITY..... STATE.....